

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed November 18, 2004. Claim 1 has been amended and Claim 16 has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 stands rejected as anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0054046 ("Mikhailov"). The standard for "anticipation" is one of fairly strict identity. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), MPEP § 2131. Claims 2-15 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0054046 ("Mikhailov") in view of "Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition," ("Courter"). Claims 2-15 depend from Claim 1. The rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the current amendment. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

[a] system for developing/customizing web-based collaborative applications employing visual-based programming, comprising:  
a user system operable to display a set of browser-based component wizards to develop application component types for a web-based collaborative application;  
a network, coupled to a set of processing components and the user system, operable to communicate data; and  
the set of processing components, each processing component in the set for implementing functionality associated with a definition for each of the application component types, wherein the functionality exists prior to customization of the definition  
for each of the application component types, wherein the set of processing components comprises a form engine, and wherein the form engine comprises a business rule validator.

The amendment to Claim 1 is supported by the specification. For example, the specification recites, "[t]he application components may include a form engine...The components of the form engine include ...a business rule validator" (Specification, page 10, lines 15-21). As another example, the specification recites, "the Form processor invokes all business rules that also provide supplementary validation rules" (Specification, page 16, lines 13-14). Thus, the amendment to Claim 1 does not present new matter. The term "business rule" is known to one of skill in the art. Business rules technology standardizes and automates much of an organization's business and decision-making processes, removing to some extent the human element that is prone to inconsistency and error. Business rules determine what action should be taken based on a company's internal guidelines, business practices and/or regulatory compliance.

Mikhailov does not disclose each and every element set forth in the pending claims, some distinctions of which are set forth below. Mikhailov discloses a forms handling system which includes a forms wizard but neither teaches nor suggests the claimed form engine comprising a business rule validator. Applicant also submits that while the Examiner points to page 382 and Figure 17.2 of Courter as showing a business rule wizard, examination of Figure 17.2 on page 382 of Courter reveals an e-mail rules wizard which can invoke various rules for the management of messages in a single user's email account. There is no teaching or suggestion in the portions of Courter cited by the Examiner that the information specified in the form of Figure 17.2 is used to validate data as described in the present specification. For example, on page 11, lines 7-10 the specification recites, "[t]he business rule validator passes the user data through the administrator-defined specialized validation Business Rules to ensure that all data requirements are met before data is stored in the database." The cited art neither teaches nor suggests validating data in this manner.

Thus, because the forms handling system of Mikhailov does not include a form engine with a business rule validator, Mikhailov does not disclose the claimed limitations, and therefore Mikhailov does not and cannot anticipate the claimed limitations. Mikhailov provides no suggestion or motivation to modify such that the claimed limitations are met. Further, Courter does not remedy Mikhailov such that the claimed limitations are met, nor does Courter provide suggestion or motivation to modify such that the claimed limitations are met. Consequently, the cited art does not render the claimed limitations obvious. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

New Claims


Dependent Claim 16 has been added. Claim 16 depends from independent Claim 1 and recites," [t]he system according to claim 1, wherein business rules are used to validate form data." Added dependent Claim 16 is patentably distinct from the cited art for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 1, recited above. Further, the cited art neither teaches nor suggests using business rules to validate form data.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-16. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

**Sprinkle IP Law Group**  
Attorneys for Applicant



John Adair  
Reg. No. 48,828

Date: February 18, 2005

1301 W. 25<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 408  
Austin, Texas 78705  
Tel. (512) 637-9220  
Fax. (512) 371-9088